

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, and 13-16 and the Abstract of the Disclosure have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. The amendments are supported by the specification and claims 1, 6, and 13-16, as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

Reconsideration of the claimed invention is requested in view of the following remarks.

Objection to the Abstract

The Abstract of the Disclosure was objected to for a minor informality, e.g., reciting "comprises" and "comprising." As shown in the above Abstract, the language has been updated. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The rejection of claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, is respectfully traversed in view of the following:

- a) The Office asserts that the preamble language of the claims does not accurately reflect the actual invention, in which the Office alleges that the invention is really a purification or distillation process. (*See* present Office Action at page 2). However, Applicants point out that the process for obtaining oligomers, as recited in the preamble, would clearly include purification or distillation, as understood by one of ordinary skill in the art.
- b) The Office asserts that reciting a "first distillation" step without reciting a second distillation step is ambiguous. (*See id.*). Therefore, Applicants have amended claim 1 to remove the term "first."
- c) The Office asserts that claim 1 is directed to passive instead of active steps. (*Id.* at page 3). Applicants point out, however, that the claim clearly recites several active steps, in which such active terms as "removing", "separating" and "condensing" are recited.

d) The Office asserts that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the phrase “ the transesterification cataylyst.” (*See id.*) Therefore, Applicants have edited the claim language to recite “a transesterification cataylyst,” for proper antecedent basis.

e) The Office asserts that the use of the term “condensing” in claim 1 is in inconsistent with the term “condensation” in claims 5 and 10-12. (*See id.*) However, Applicants point out that one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly understand that “condensation” refers back to the “condensing” step.

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are requested. Allowance of the claims is respectfully solicited.

In the event the Examiner believes an interview might serve in any way to advance the prosecution of this application, the undersigned is available at the telephone number noted below.

The Office is authorized to charge any necessary fees to Deposit Account No. 03-2775.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 03-2775, under Order No. 12810-00189-US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: October 15, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Bryant L. Young/
Bryant L. Young
Registration No.: 49,073
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1875 Eye Street, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 331-7111
(202) 293-6229 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicants